

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 34576

STATE OF IDAHO,)	2008 Unpublished Opinion No. 609
)	
Plaintiff-Respondent,)	Filed: August 20, 2008
)	
v.)	Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk
)	
RIAN KRISTOPHER HILL,)	THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
)	OPINION AND SHALL NOT
Defendant-Appellant.)	BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
)	

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Deborah A. Bail, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and concurrent unified sentences of ten years, with two years determinate, for burglary, and seven years, with two years determinate, for possession of a controlled substance, affirmed.

Molly J. Huskey, State Appellate Public Defender; Heather M. Carlson, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Jessica M. Lorello, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

PER CURIAM

Rian Kristopher Hill was convicted of burglary, Idaho Code § 18-1401, and possession of a controlled substance, I.C. § 37-2732(c). The district court imposed concurrent unified sentences of ten years with two years determinate for burglary and seven years with two years determinate for possession of a controlled substance and retained jurisdiction. At the conclusion of the retained jurisdiction program, the court relinquished jurisdiction and ordered execution of Hill's sentence. Hill appeals the court's decision to relinquish jurisdiction and contends that the court abused its discretion in failing to *sua sponte* reduce his sentence upon relinquishing jurisdiction.

The decision as to whether to place a defendant on probation or, instead, to relinquish jurisdiction is committed to the discretion of the sentencing court. *State v. Hernandez*, 122 Idaho 227, 230, 832 P.2d 1162, 1165 (Ct. App. 1992); *State v. Lee*, 117 Idaho 203, 786 P.2d 594 (Ct.

App. 1990); *State v. Toohill*, 103 Idaho 565, 567, 650 P.2d 707, 709 (Ct. App. 1982). Therefore, a decision to relinquish jurisdiction will not be disturbed on appeal except for an abuse of discretion. *State v. Chapman*, 120 Idaho 466, 816 P.2d 1023 (Ct. App. 1991). The record in this case shows that the district court properly considered the information before it and determined that probation was not appropriate. We hold that the district court did not abuse its discretion, and we therefore affirm the order relinquishing jurisdiction.

Sentencing is a matter for the trial court's discretion. Both our standard of review and the factors to be considered in evaluating the reasonableness of a sentence are well established and need not be repeated here. See *State v. Hernandez*, 121 Idaho 114, 117-18, 822 P.2d 1011, 1014-15 (Ct. App. 1991); *State v. Lopez*, 106 Idaho 447, 449-51, 680 P.2d 869, 871-73 (Ct. App. 1984); *Toohill*, 103 Idaho at 568, 650 P.2d at 710.

Applying the foregoing standards, and having reviewed the record in this case, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion in ordering execution of Hill's original sentence, without modification. Therefore, the order relinquishing jurisdiction and directing execution of Hill's previously suspended sentence is affirmed.